



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,567	05/26/2005	Ulrich Sander	33997.0115	2192
26712	7590	01/18/2008	EXAMINER	
HODGSON RUSS LLP			CONSILVIO, MARK J	
THE GUARANTY BUILDING			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
140 PEARL STREET			2872	
SUITE 100				
BUFFALO, NY 14202-4040				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/536,567

**Applicant(s)**

SANDER, ULRICH

**Examiner**

Mark Consilvio

**Art Unit**

2872

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 14-29.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Alessandro Amari*

**ALESSANDRO AMARI  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims as finally rejected do not distinguish over the prior art.

In response to applicant's interpretation of the Biber reference (specifically, col. 1, lines 51-65), it is noted that, in order for the illumination to be optimized for both the main and assistant microscopes of Nakamura, the light must follow the same effective optical paths to each observer. In other words, if the microscopes have different components or configurations, optimizing illumination for one microscope will not necessarily result in optimization in the other. However, by utilizing the same objective for both microscopes, as in Biber, the optical paths will coincide at least to that point and can more easily be designed to be substantially similar. Further, it is noted that no evidence has been supplied to support applicant's conclusion as is required to rebut the *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In response to applicant's repeated argument that the Nakamura reference teaches away from the proposed combination, the examiner reasserts that a prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, "the prior art's mere disclosure of more than one alternative does not constitute a teaching away from any of these alternatives because such disclosure does not criticize, discredit, or otherwise discourage the solution claimed...." *In re Fulton*, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). See also MPEP § 2123. Again, independent objectives are not required for independent magnification adjustment. Also, "easy" detachment of the microscope is not a claimed feature, nor is it the principle operation of the microscope. Additionally, the prior art teaches several alternative "easy" microscope detachment means as cited in the previous Office Action that evidence the abilities and knowledge of one of ordinary skill. Thus, applicant's reasoning fails to demonstrate how the proposed combination changes the principle operation of the Nakamura or renders Nakamura inoperable for its intended purpose.

In response to applicant's argument concerning claim 28, it is noted that the limitation(s) upon which applicant relies (i.e., a second part of the main objective) must be given their broadest reasonable construction as would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art.

*Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005). First, the examiner disagrees that the only parts to an objective must be lenses. Housings, gears, aperture stops, mirrors and filters are just some of the elements that might be arranged as "part" of the objective. Second, Nakamura's illumination arrangement is substantially identical to the arrangement in applicant's specification. Thus, even if the mirror M1 could not be considered part of the objective, the reference would still inherently meet the claimed limitations.

In response to applicant's arguments that there is not proper motivation to combine the references, it is noted that differences in the prior art or alternative ways to combine the prior art are only relevant in terms of the preponderance of all evidence. Thus, the assertion of singular instances of how the prior art might be combined to create materially different combination fails to address the prior art as a whole. In short, the focus when making a determination of obviousness should be on what a person of ordinary skill in the pertinent art would have known at the time of the invention, and on what such a person would have reasonably expected to have been able to do in view of that knowledge. This is so regardless of whether the source of that knowledge and ability was documentary prior art, general knowledge in the art, or common sense..